



**Region IV Citizen Review Panel**  
**707 N. Armstrong Pl, Boise, ID 83704**  
**White Pine Room**  
**Tuesday, October 5, 2021**  
**4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

Join Zoom Meeting  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87449110153>

Meeting ID: 874 4911 0153

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/km2v1Mpl4>

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **Meeting members:**

Brian McCauley, Nicole Noltensmeyer, Allison Berkson, Kym Nilsen, Shannon McCarthy, Britney Journee, Darcie Bobrowski. Quorum established.

### **Staff:**

Linda Stormes, Courtney Boyce, Laura Smith (CDH).

### **Guests:**

Christopher Freeburne, Miren Unsworth, Roxanne Printz, Niki Flock, Cameron Gilliland, Lance McCleve (DHW)  
Senator Wintrow.

Attendees: 16

### **Call Meeting to Order**

Brian McCauley, Region IV Citizen Review Panel Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00pm.

**Motion:** Brian made a motion to consent to the agenda. Kym seconded. None opposed. The motion carries.

**Motion:** Brian made a motion to confirm the meeting minutes from September. Kym seconded. None opposed. The motion carries.

Courtney provided the Monthly Evaluation Form links into the chat.

Courtney will send the Monthly Evaluation Form to the Executive Committee, for Nicole or another member of the Executive Committee to send out to the Panel. Rather than the Panel being accountable to responding to CDH for the completion of the monthly evaluation form, they will be responsible for completing that information and reporting back to the Panel. The PHD Liaison will still be submitting the monthly evaluation form link, with the Panel reporting back to each other on its completion. The Liaison will still have access to the data as they will be providing the link to the Executive Committee for completion and distribution.

### **DHW Discussion**

Marin has taken a different position in the department and Cameron is the new Division Administrator. Cameron provided an introduction to himself. Brian asked to clarify if Roxanne and Miren are out of the feedback loop now. Cameron clarified that Miren is stepping out but will be watching closely and that Roxanne will still be in the feedback loop. Brian discussed that Allison Berkson is the CRP appointed IDHW liaison, and a point of contact for the Panel.

Nicole brought up two specific cases that were referenced from the last meeting that Miren and Roxanne were to follow through with. Roxanne appreciated that Nicole brought that up and referenced that these cases provided an opportunity to review their internal process. Roxanne discussed how/when to escalate in supervision based on the analysis that they have conducted, and at what point does the Supervisor get involved to inquire about the history and the analysis. That supervisor can then make a clinical decision and be accountable for the next steps. It is not a check box, it is a mindful analysis of the history and the content when those decisions are discussed outside of DHW, such as an MDT. The collective impact of the history and content can also be considered. Roxanne asked a number of hypothetical questions that this process can answer including: who is reviewing the history, when, how do we escalate it, how do we identify those patterns and when do the patterns move into an MDT? How do we intervene, how can we do this process sooner? How do we provide targeted services to safety threats, especially on a more intense level?

When that has been completed, Roxanne would be happy to provide a process document, including how it will be monitored and technically approached from DHW so we can see the overall outcome of how it has changed their system.

Nicole asked that any policy or process that you put in place, would include tangential items, including three different reports from three different sources (ex. neighbor, teacher, other mandatory reporter). Roxanne identified that this was an example of a case that can make an impact.

Allison discussed that in unsubstantial reports, it doesn't necessarily indicate a risk level. Allison provided an example of a general accident, or unsubstantiated reports where abuse occurred from someone who was not a legal guardian there still needs to be a discussion regarding the content and risk level. Sometimes there is a safety issue but does not meet criteria for unsubstantial abuse. There is a process, however there is a grey area based on the criteria including perpetrator. Cameron and Roxanne will follow up, per Miren, on how to provide more information on unsubstantiated cases and how that translates into safety concerns. Roxanne said that she is open to feedback, and would like to discuss with Andi what she is seeing at the Central Office. She also said she is open to reviewing any specific cases, and for the Panel to please feel free to pass them along.

Brian stated that he is intrigued by the interaction that exists between the Department and law enforcement. There could be a significant amount of history that is known on the law enforcement side but

not to the Department and vice versa. Is there any bridge that brings those two groups together on these kind of things?

There was a discussion between cross talk between law enforcement on what is initiated versus what is initiated on a Department side. The referrals that are completed on the Department side are shared with law enforcement, however they do not have a unified system. All referrals in Boise City and Ada County go to law enforcement, but that is not the case in other jurisdictions. The history of DHW referrals transfers between jurisdictions, ex. started in Region III, but moved to Region IV. The exception is law enforcement involvement, unless it is documented in iCourts. A referral could come into our Central Intake Unit, and if that is not disclosed that someone was convicted of murder, they might not have that information.

It was asked, is there a system that could be legislatively initiated to unify law enforcement and safety referrals? There has been some movement on a statute that was passed, a comprehensive criminal justice information system that is shared across multiple state agencies. The Working group would be led by the State Controller's Office. From Miren's read there is a lot of support. The governor's office is highly supportive as an effective, collaborative, interagency tool.

It is the responsibility of the Prosecutor's Office to address MDT to discuss really complex cases. It might be good for the Panel to inquire about how that functions, are they functioning well. Not every county has one formed. Boise, Meridian, Star, Eagle, Ada County MDT that is housed over at FACES. They happens typically every two weeks. If any agency has a case that needs to have a cohort discussion sooner, they will conduct a mini-MDT that is set up quickly. Niki Flock has been attempting to work on an MDT in Valley County. The prosecutor Brian Nagel has asked to slow down the process, so that he can become more familiar with the process. Niki's intention is to work with Deedee Phillips, who is part of probation and parole. Niki's contact from DHW is Ree, but she is not able to travel up there yet. Niki will be doing that in the meantime. That will likely be at the start of the new year. Courtney referenced VCORP and sent an email to Niki to introduce Kym and share Shelly's information as the Project Director.

The Panel discussed parental incarceration. It was noted that parental incarceration can impede parental abilities that would lead to a substantiated case. Where it gets tricky, when a parent is incarcerated to do due diligence to do case planning regarding the case. Maybe the parent has been incarcerated for the duration of the case and is now being released at 6 + months, and the Department and other system partners feels like we are back at square one and it is time to give them a chance. Brian addressed the age of the child, but DHW said they couldn't speak to that specifically, as incarceration can be a factor in delaying permanency.

Brian inquired if the Department works with the courts to try and provide some sort of bench notes for judges so there is a standard approach to cases across the state. Discussed how there's a difference in how judges treat cases. Brian is curious as to how we fix the issues if there isn't a standard anyway. Discussed judge training across the state and who will be the new chair for the child protection committee but are actively working on it.

Britney inquired about who restarts the clock. DHW shared that it can vary between the DHW or the courts. DHW reported they would need to look in the court order to find the reasons 'why' behind changes in the permanency plan. Discussed how it can vary depending on a case and what's going out. Department can recommend yet the court may say mom and dad need more time. So you can see it on both sides. It's hard to see why a decision was made sometimes

Child and Adolescent Needs Assessment (CANS) usually combines with comprehensive needs assessment. The ICAN system is overseen by the Division of Behavioral Health in the Department so any

private provider that does assessments for youth related to mental health needs enters the information in the system. In an ideal world, it was hoped that every case worker in child welfare could access any assessment on a child in the Department's custody. They can't do that simply. Reasons are related to federal privacy controls with mental health information and some systemic barriers.

Britney shared concerns with the access controls to the system. It is not able to be done that easily, given federal privacy controls. Raised an important question on how that information can be delivered to them. They were hoping that it was a control setting they could adjust, but instead it will be a process for how CANS information is shared and delivered.

It is the access to the system, not necessarily the information themselves, that has confidentiality controls. Discussed the CAN needs approval from the parent, as well as provide the results back to the Department, where these nuances provide barriers. The general release of information would be covered.

Brian identified that these conversations provide collaboration and solutions-oriented discussions. Miren discussed how she identifies the Panel is passionate about making meaningful systems change, and looking forward to moving forward in transparency and communication .

### **Quarterly Report Recommendations**

The Panel discussed recommendations on improving the quality-assurance process at DHW. The Panel also discussed information on child-fatality data in Idaho and who/how it is reported to DHW. DHW has a process and an internal team for reviewing near-fatality data. How can the panel review that information? Is there a standard that the Panel can review?

Here is the Child Welfare policy. It was believed an update in 2015 added in Near Fatalities:  
<https://publicdocuments.dhw.idaho.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=1024&dbid=0&repo=PUBLIC-DOCUMENTS>

How many cases in our region have had a near fatality experience? This would include information on children that were reunified and ultimately passed away. Are these near fatality experiences tracked in the system for children with child welfare system involvement?

Brian there is a document guide after it is named and categorized, it is classified to see who can view it. With the statute, that includes prior referrals, assessments. There are some documents that are not within that statute, and out of transparency the Department will provide that information to the CRP. Courtney requested that this information also be provided to her, so that she can use this as a guide for ongoing training for Panel members.

Allison presented the remaining recommendations that would include improving data reporting processes and identifying parents with serious mental illness requesting inpatient rehabilitation services. Based on the discussion that occurred with DHW, the Panel will continue to research more before proceeding forward with the recommendation.

Here's the link to HB 233: <https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/billbookmark/?yr=2021&bn=H0233>. That bill was discussed in relation to the recommendations and content. Other data included:  
<https://healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/services-programs/children-families/child-protection-and-foster-care/about-idaho-child-protection>.

**Motion:** Brian made a motion to remove the final recommendation from the shared report document. Allison seconded. None opposed. The motion carries.

**Motion:** Brian made a motion to approve the first two recommendations in the shared report document, after it has been polished by the PHD liaison. Allison seconded. None opposed. The motion carries.

Based on time, the Panel will discuss Panel updates first and then address CAPTA. This is not an amendment to the agenda, just the timeline for review.

### **Membership Updates**

Will address bylaws, Nicole will look at applications and provide feedback to Courtney who can follow up with applicants that are of interest to the Panel. Nicole will look at the candidates and provide input. Darcie Anderson was previously informed. Shannon was requested to review the bylaws, and provide that input back to the Panel before the next meeting.

### **CAPTA**

Allison shared that some of this was addressed in her recommendations. CAPTA states that CRPs should be open for public input. Allison inquired about putting together a form, who we are, identifying that they can't change specific outcomes, and questions regarding systemic issues that are brought about. This would be receiving public input without a public forum. This could be submitted via email, or in technology, or to a meeting with guidelines. Nicole is willing to create guidelines regarding what can be shared.

### **Next meeting**

- MOU/CDH – 20 – 30 minutes
  - Nicole, Shannon to review technical language
- Mission/vision/values – 20 minutes
- 10 minutes Update on the Trauma Informed Conference
- 10 minutes amended bylaws
- 10 minutes Strategy for identifying candidates
- Near Fatality Discussion 10 minutes

### **Adjourn**

Brian McCauley the Region IV Citizen Review Panel Chair, adjourned the meeting at 6:08pm.

*Meeting minutes prepared by Linda Stormes.*